



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,415	03/17/2004	Dai Kimura	5254-005-US01	3866
79184 7590 12/12/2008 HANIFY & KING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 1875 K STREET, NW SUITE 707 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
EXAMINER CUMMING, WILLIAM D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/12/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,415

Applicant(s)

KIMURA, DAI

Examiner

WILLIAM D. CUMMING

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 AND 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 10 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-7, 11 and 13-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2, 4 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 8 and 10 are allowed.
2. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).
3. Claims 2, 4, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11, and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Gollamudi, et al.**

Gollamudi, et al disclose a radio communication apparatus in a radio packet communication system for feeding back radio link quality information, which has been measured on a packet receiving side, to a transmitting side and adaptively controlling a modulation scheme and/or encoding rate on the transmitting side using the quality information (paragraphs 4, 6, and 7), comprising estimating means for estimating a variation-with-time characteristic of the radio link quality using the radio link quality information reported by the packet receiving side (paragraph 16, etc.). Changeover means for adaptively changing over a target error rate using the variation-with-time characteristic (paragraph 17, etc). Deciding means for deciding a modulation scheme and/or encoding rate, "*in such a manner*" that packet error rate becomes equal to the target error rate, using the radio link quality information as well as reception success/failure information reported by the packet receiving side (paragraph 21, etc.) and means for transmitting a packet based upon the modulation scheme and/or encoding rate decided (paragraph 22).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Anticipatory reference need not duplicate, word for word, what is in claims; anticipation can occur when claimed limitation is "*inherent*" or otherwise implicit in relevant reference (Standard Havens Products Incorporated v. Gencor Industries Incorporated, 21 USPQ2d 1321). During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims (Ex parte Akamatsu, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320, In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11). In response to Applicant's argument, the law of anticipation requires that a distinction be made between the invention described or taught and the invention claimed. **It does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches.** Assuming that a reference is properly "*prior art*," it is only necessary that the claims under consideration "*read on*" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or "*fully met*" by it. It was held in In re Donohue, 226 USPQ 619, that, "*It is well settled that prior art under 35 USC §102(b) must sufficiently describe the claimed invention to have placed the public in possession of it...Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combine the description of the invention with his own knowledge to make the claimed invention.*" Clear inference to the artisan must be considered,

In re Preda, 159 USPQ 342. A prior art reference must be considered together with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, In re Samour, 197 USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be “*given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.*” Claim term is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and applicant cannot overcome “*heavy presumption*” that term takes on its ordinary meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (*Teleflex Inc. v. Ficos North America Corp.*, CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). “*Arguments that the alleged anticipatory prior art is nonanalogous art' or teaches away from the invention' or is not recognized as solving the problem solved by the claimed invention, [are] not germane' to a rejection under section 102.*” *Twin Disc, Inc. v. United States*, 231 USPQ 417, 424 (Cl. Ct. 1986) (quoting *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 213 USPQ 1, 7 (CCPA 1982)). A reference is no less anticipatory if, after disclosing the invention, the reference then disparages it. The question whether a reference “*teaches away*” from the invention is inapplicable to an anticipation analysis. *Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998).

Gollamudi does disclose the following features of claims 1 and 3: (i) estimating means for estimating a variation-with-time characteristic of the radio link quality using the radio link quality information reported by the packet receiving side or using a pilot symbol received from the packet receiving side is disclose in paragraph 16 and other places; (ii) changeover means for adaptively changing over a target error rate using the variation-with-time characteristic can be found in paragraph 17 and other places; and (iii) deciding means for deciding a modulation scheme and/or encoding rate, in such a manner that packet error rate becomes equal to the target error rate can be found in paragraph 21 and other places. In addition, **Gollamudi** discloses the following features recited by claim 11: (i) estimating means for estimating a variation-with-time characteristic of the radio link quality using a pilot symbol received from the packet transmitting side; (ii) changeover means for adaptively changing over a target error rate using the variation-with-time characteristic is disclose in paragraph 16 and other places; (iii) means for correcting the radio link quality value in such a manner that packet error rate becomes equal to the target error rate is disclose in paragraph 17 and other places; and (iv) means for reporting the corrected radio link quality value to a packet transmitting side can be found in paragraph 22 and in other places. Finally, **Gollamudi** also fails to teach the following features of claim 15: (i) means for measuring throughput of a received radio packet is described in paragraph 16 and other places; (ii) control means for adaptively controlling a target error rate so as to maximize the throughput is described in paragraph 17

and other places; (iii) means for correcting the radio link quality value in such a manner that packet error rate becomes equal to the target error rate is described in paragraph 21 and other places; and (iv) means for reporting the corrected radio link quality value to a packet transmitting side as describe in paragraph 22 and other places.

Applicants' attorney has specifically point out every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. The attorney failed to identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

Conclusion

7. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

10. DUPLICATE COPY OF FORMS FOR FEE PROCESSING NO LONGER REQUIRED

Numerous United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) forms utilized for making fee payments in regard to an application, a reexamination proceeding or a patent include language requesting a duplicate copy of the form for fee processing. In the past, the duplicate copy of the form was needed as the paper application file would be in one area of the Office while the processing of the fee would be done in another area of the Office. It is current Office procedure to scan forms containing an authorization to charge or credit a fee amount to a deposit account into the Image File Wrapper (IFW) of an application, a reexamination proceeding or a patent. Once the form is scanned into IFW, it is available and viewable throughout the Office for, *inter alia*, fee processing. As a result, there is no longer a need for the duplicate copy. Office forms (e.g., PTOISBIO5; PTOL-85B; PTOISBI6; PTOISBI7i; PTOISBI7p; PTOISBI8; PTOISB119; PTOISBI22; PTOISBI24A; PTOISBI29; PTOISBI30; PTOISBI3 1; PTOISBI32; PTOISBI37; PTOISBI43; PTOISBI45; PTOISBISO; PTOISBI56; PTOISBR7; PTOISBI58; PTOISBI65; PTOISBI66; PTOISBI94; PTOISBI13PCT; and PTO-1390) will be revised to remove the request for a duplicate copy of the form for fee processing. In the event that a duplicate copy of a form is needed for fee processing (e.g., the form has not been scanned into IFW or the form is submitted in a security application), the Office will make the necessary copy of the form for fee processing. Inquiries concerning this notice may be directed to James Engel, Senior Legal Advisor in the Office of Patent Legal Administration, at (571) 272-7701 or at PatentPractice@uspto.gov.

11. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing.

Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or

clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration.

Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D. CUMMING** whose telephone number is

571-272-7861. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday- Friday, 11:00am-8:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on 571-272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WILLIAM D CUMMING/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
william.cumming@uspto.gov